

PPD 542: Policy and Program Evaluation

Course Director: William D. Leach, Ph.D.

Office Hours: upon request, leachw@price.usc.edu

Course Description

PPD 542 Policy and Program Evaluation (4 units)

“Methods and models for policy and program evaluation; methods of collecting and analyzing evaluation data; processes for linking evaluation to policy formulation and program management. Prerequisite: PPD 502x.”

~ USC Catalogue 2014/15

Program evaluation is the systematic investigation of social programs (including policies, plans, and regulations) to determine whether a particular program is achieving its objectives. By law, regulation, and custom, organizations must routinely evaluate how well their programs are working. For example, legislatures and interest groups frequently call upon evaluators to predict the consequences of proposed policies or to evaluate the outcomes of existing policies. Such knowledge promotes better decisions regarding whether programs should be continued, improved, expanded, or curtailed.

The most agile agencies and nonprofit organizations can be described as "learning organizations"—continually adapting to new circumstances and information. Formal evaluation plays a pivotal role in helping organizations learn.

Knowledge of evaluation methods enables public administrators to:

- a) use evaluation findings to improve ongoing programs;
- b) select and work with evaluation consultants to design an evaluation project;
- c) write grant proposals to submit to funding organizations that require performance monitoring;
- d) critique evaluation studies cited by various organizations in a policy debate.

This course introduces students to the art and science of policy evaluation. Students will learn methods of collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and communicating information used in evaluation studies.

An explicit goal of the course is to provide students with the skills required for successful completion of the “capstone” course, *PPD 546 – Professional Practice of Public Administration*. In both courses students work in teams to develop an evaluation proposal related to an actual public policy or program implemented by a public or nonprofit agency. In this course, PPD 542, you will create an evaluation proposal for a mock client during the last nine weeks of the course. In the capstone course, PPD 546, you will develop a similar proposal for a real client during the first few weeks, and then you will carry out your evaluation project during the same semester.

Learning Objectives

Knowledge Objectives:

1. Appreciate the importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.
2. Appreciate specific design principles that are common to a number of different types of research, such as the critical role of theories and hypotheses.
3. Understand the main approaches for detecting cause-and-effect relationships in scientific research, including those based on experimental and non-experimental designs.
4. Learn how to proceed from a concept to a variable designed to measure the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.
5. Understand the advantages and limitations of various types of data collection methods, including surveys, interviews, participant observation, content analysis, and, secondary data.
6. Understand the differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.
7. Be able to carry out and interpret simple descriptive and inferential analyses of evaluation data, and be able to read and understand studies using more complex techniques, including linear regression models.
8. Appreciate some of the ethical and political considerations in evaluation research, and understand how to position a study to influence policy decisions.

Practice Objectives:

1. *Analytic problem solving.* This course contributes to the competency of being able to “analyze, synthesize, think critically, and solve problems,” which is one of the universal competencies for all programs accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.
2. *Teamwork and project management.* Students will need to collaborate to complete the evaluation proposal in an efficient and fair manner.
3. *Professional writing.* Students will apply and polish skills required for effective practice, including how to write an evaluation proposal.
4. *Communication.* Student teams will develop a media-rich oral presentation of the proposal in the form of a “pitch” to a mock client for the evaluation.
5. *Producing evaluation research.* Learn how to write an effective evaluation proposal and how to conduct evaluation research.
6. *Consuming evaluation research.* Learn how to comprehend and critique evaluation studies published by think tanks, government agencies, or academic journals.

Textbooks and Materials

Texts to purchase:

- Fink, Arlene (2015) *Evaluation Fundamentals: Insights into Program Effectiveness, Quality, and Value*. 3rd Edition. Sage.
- Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik (2016) *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*, 5th Edition. CQ Press

Texts to download:

- NSF [National Science Foundation] (2010) *The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*.
<http://informal.science.org/documents/TheUserFriendlyGuide.pdf>
- GAO [US Government Accountability Office] (2012) *Designing Evaluations*. GAO-12-208G <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588146.pdf>

Articles:

- Besides the textbooks, most required readings are supplied in a [Google Drive folder linked here](#), and in the General section of the course. Others are available on the Web, and are hyperlinked from the weekly schedule of readings provided in Moodle and at the end of this syllabus.

Grading Policies

Course Components

Component	Quantity	Weight (each)	Total Fraction of Course Grade
1. Discussions	12	2%	24%
2. Quizzes	10	2%	20%
3. Data analysis labs	3	4%	12%
4. Evaluation Proposal			
• Blogs	5	2%	10%
• Partial Draft (group)	1	2%	2%
• Full Draft Proposal (group)	1	2%	2%
• Final Proposal (group)	1	20%	18%
• Project Pitch Video (group)	1	5%	5%
• CATME teammate assessment	1	5%	5%
Total			100%

Individual Work (66%)

Discussions (24%): In response to discussion prompts that reference assigned readings or instructional materials, students will post their response by Day 4 of the week, and will reply to two other students by Day 7. Twelve discussions are assigned in Weeks 1-6 and 11-15.

Quizzes (20%): Quizzes are designed to test your mastery of basic concepts introduced in the readings and lectures. Ten quizzes (one per week) are assigned in Weeks 1-10.

Data Analysis Labs (12%): During weeks 8, 9, and 10, which focus on data analysis, students will complete a data analysis “laboratory” assignment. Live sessions hosted at the beginning of each of these weeks will focus on the lab. Live sessions will be recorded and archived for students unable to attend.

Blogs (10%): Blogs are a form of individual contribution to the group evaluation proposal. Blog assignments typically entail (a) archival research to locate reference material to support the evaluation proposal, and (b) individual reflections regarding how the group should proceed in crafting certain sections of the evaluation proposal (e.g. research questions, research design, data collection methods, data analysis methods). Five blogs (one per week) are assigned in Weeks 7-10, and 12.

Group Work (34%)

In Week 7, students will begin working on the main project for the course, which is a team project to develop an evaluation proposal related to an actual public policy or program implemented by a public or nonprofit agency. This project requires students to apply all of the concepts learned throughout the course to the dynamic and ambiguous environment of ground-level program evaluation.

NOTE: Students will not actually carry out an evaluation study. Rather, the assignment entails crafting a 15-to-20 page evaluation *proposal* that details the practical and theoretical questions to be answered by the study, and the research methods that would be used to answer the stated research questions.

Students will work in teams of approximately four students. The course director will assign students to teams, and will assign the focal policy or program to be evaluated. The course director will assign students to teams & projects based on students’ policy interests and other considerations shared at the beginning of class. Once project assignments are made, students are expected to work with the team through the completion of the course. There will be no reassignment of students to other teams following the initial assignment. Should issues arise regarding team dynamics, the section instructor will work with the team to address these issues.

A **partial draft (2%)** and **full draft (2%)** are due in weeks 11 and 13, so that teams can receive feedback from the section instructor.

Project Pitch Video (5%): In Week 14, teams will prepare a 10-minute summary of the evaluation proposal in the form of a pitch to a mock client. The presentation must be recorded using VoiceThread and PowerPoint, or another video medium with prior instructor approval. This presentation should translate the technical material to make it understandable and compelling to a non-expert political leader or public administrator.

Final Draft Evaluation Proposal (20%): In Week 15, teams will produce a professional-quality report, approximately 15–20 pages (single-spaced, including graphics), that details the proposed project.

CATME Teammate Assessment (5%): In Week 15, students will assess both their own and their teammates’ contributions to the evaluation proposal assignment. All students are required to provide thoughtful assessments via an online survey administered by www.catme.org. Grades for this assignment will be informed by your teammates’ evaluations of your contributions to group work. *(Note: The CATME assignment is only one measure of teamwork. Students who do not contribute substantially to a group assignment will be penalized, including potentially a score of zero on the assignment.)*

Due Dates and Times

Due dates for assignments and discussions are stated in day numbers, where Day 1 of each week is a Wednesday. Assignments are due by 11:55 p.m. Pacific Time.

Late Policy

The asynchronous online framework allows considerable flexibility for completing the required work. All of the reading and many of the assignments are available at the beginning of this course for students who wish to work ahead of schedule. No assignments are accepted after their due dates without prior permission. At their discretion, faculty may grant extensions for extenuating circumstances, as defined in the USC student handbook.

Numeric Ranges for Final Course Grades

Grade	Range
A	≥ 93%
A-	≥ 90% < 93%
B+	≥ 87% < 90%
B	≥ 83%, < 87%
B-	≥ 80%, < 83%

Grade	Range
C+	≥ 77%, < 80%
C	≥ 73%, < 77%
C-	≥ 70%, < 73%
D	≥ 60%, < 70%
F	< 60%

Grading Rubrics

The following rubric applies to discussions and blogs. Up to 8 points (out of 20) will be deducted from discussions if a student does not post the required number of follow-up replies to classmates.

Grading Rubric for Discussions and Blogs (20 points max)				
<i>Criteria</i>	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Relevance, Application, Originality (6 points)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, and provides unique perspective (6)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, usually has clear focus (5)	Addresses the question but with little substance, inconsistencies, or partial incoherence (3)	Fails to address the question posed, or incoherent (0)
Insight, Observation, Analysis (6 points)	Offers significant analysis and insight with clear understanding of the question (6)	Offers some analysis or insight with clear understanding of the question (5)	Addresses concepts already highlighted; rudimentary understanding of the question (3)	No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, or shows minimal understanding of the question (0)
Details & Evidence (4 points)	Details and evidence are effective, illuminating, and pertinent to the question (4)	Details and evidence are elaborated and pertinent to the question (3)	Details and evidence are scant or repetitious (2)	Details are absent or tangential to the question (0)
Writing Style & Mechanics (6 points)	Writing style is clear, concise, inviting, and nearly free of mechanical errors. (4)	Some stylistic problems or mechanical errors. (3)	Multiple errors or patterns of errors. (2)	Errors are frequent and severe. (0)

General guidance on discussions and blogs:

- If you are addressing a topic that is highly contested, one way to strengthen your response is to clearly and fairly articulate both sides of the controversy. Analytical arguments that come down on one side or the other are welcome, especially if they critique the opposing perspective through theoretical or empirical arguments that reference the assigned readings, videos, lectures, or other sources.
- In addition to demonstrating your knowledge of the assigned readings, feel free to cite sources beyond the required materials. This helps you integrate your new knowledge from PPD 542 with ideas you have gleaned from your other courses or experiences.
- Please cite page numbers wherever feasible. If your citation is especially insightful, novel, or confusing, your instructors may wish to look it up.

Grading Rubric for Project Pitch Video in VoiceThread (100 points max)

Criteria:	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Content (40 points)	Coherent and well-organized presentation responsive to the assignment (40)	Coherent, with minor flaws in organization or responsiveness to the assignment. (30 or 35)	Presentation lacked clarity or credibility, or contained significant errors. (20 or 25)	Far below expectations for graduate work. (0)
Visuals (20 points)	Engaging visuals help tell the story. (need not be elaborate if a minimalist theme is more appropriate). (20)	Appropriate visuals help tell the story, with few exceptions. (15)	Visual elements lack clarity or distract from the presentation. (10)	None or inappropriate. (0)
Delivery (20 points)	Team members spoke <i>on video</i> with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, without exception. (20)	Team members spoke with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, with few exceptions. (15)	A lack of confidence, clarity, or enthusiasm detracted from the presentation. (10)	Delivery far below expectations for graduate work. (0)
Collaborative Presentation (10 points)	Each teammate has a significant speaking role. (10)	One teammate lacks a significant speaking role. (7)	Two teammates lack a significant speaking role. (4)	Only one teammate narrates the presentation.(0)
Duration (10 points)	8-10 minutes (10)	<1 minute too short or too long. (7)	1-2 minutes too short or too long. (4)	>2 minutes too short or too long. (0)

Rubric for Final Evaluation Proposal (100 points max)

POLICY OR PROGRAM OVERVIEW	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Program description, including problem definition, target population, and need (10 points)	Identifies and describes program, and sites evidence in describing the issue or goals addressed, and key beneficiaries or stakeholders (10)	Provides some detail about underlying issue or goals of program; target population; stakeholders (8)	Identifies and describes program in general terms (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Political and/or organizational context; stakeholders and evaluability (10 points)	Sophisticated use of research in analysis of political and/or organizational stakeholders and other challenges (10)	References key stakeholders, political context and/or other challenges to evaluation (8)	Identification of at least one challenge (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Program theory and logic model (10 points)	Logic model is refined and explicitly references research related to program (10)	Solid logic model that shows refinement based on research (8)	Logic model is general; little development from earlier work (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Objectives and researchable questions (10 points)	Insightful and feasible questions that will provide critical information for policy or program improvement. (10)	Feasible questions that relate to logic model and will promote program improvement (8)	Questions relate to logic model but are general or infeasible to answer. (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)

...continued on next page

<i>RESEARCH METHODS</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Partially proficient</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Appropriate and feasible research design to answer researchable questions; including design matrix (10 points)	A particularly insightful design with creative or innovative application of method to answer researchable questions. (10)	Research design is essentially complete; data proposed will address primary researchable questions. (8)	Research design is incomplete, contains flaws or biases not acknowledged; does not relate specific designs to researchable questions. (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Valid and appropriate data collection methods (10 points)	Particularly well-designed survey and interview instruments; sufficient in number; valid; will solicit valid and reliable information to answer specific researchable questions. (10)	Clearly designed instruments that have few errors and relate to researchable questions. (8)	Survey and interview questions are not specific or have issues of construction. (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Valid and appropriate data analysis methods (10 points)	Refined and sophisticated methods; supported by design and will clearly provide usable knowledge. (10)	The methods are supported by design and clearly relate to the researchable questions. (8)	Analytic methods proposed are too general, ad hoc, or do not dovetail with the design. (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)

...continued on next page

<i>REFLECTION ON METHODS AND CONTRIBUTION</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Partially proficient</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Reflection on strengths and weakness of evaluation design (10 points)	An insightful critique on grounds of internal/external validity, error, and/or bias. Discusses how design addresses vulnerabilities (10)	A solid critique of evaluation on grounds of internal and external validity and/or potential error and bias (8)	Partial conceptual understanding and application of internal and external validity (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Justification of the importance and value of the proposed evaluation (10 points)	A compelling argument about strengths and importance of evaluation (10)	Evaluation is clearly linked to programmatic issues, needs, or opportunities (8)	Some discussion of importance of evaluation (6)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
<i>PRESENTATION</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Partially Proficient</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Organization and visual elements (5 points)	Well organized. Attractive and innovative use of text/graphic elements to include display of data; flow charts; maps, etc. Graphic elements help drive argument. Visual elements properly titled and discussed in text. (5)	A logically structured product with an acceptable executive summary. Incorporates other visual elements such as charts, graphs, text charts, or other visual models to an adequate extent. (4)	Basic organization detracts from argument; lacks acceptable executive summary. Uses only section headings and bullets to break up argument and direct reader through argument. (3)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)
Grammar and style (10 points)	Grammar and style are highly professional and well-polished. (5)	Grammar and style are clear and concise. (4)	Contains errors in grammar or syntax. (3)	Does not meet minimum standard of quality (0)

Live Sessions – with the Course Director

Live sessions are hosted in Adobe Connect on Day 01 of designated weeks from 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific/Trojan Time (TT).

Please refer to this guide on how to attend a live session: <http://goo.gl/3KJco9>

Each live session may entail:

- Lectures on course material
- Guidance on statistical lab assignments
- Interactive Q&A with students and faculty

Enter the live session using the following link:

[XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXTBDXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX](#)

The live session schedule is as follows:

Week 02: Jan 13, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 04: Jan 27, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 06: Feb 10, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 07: Feb 24, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 08: Feb 24, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 09: Feb 24, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific
Week 10: Feb 24, Wednesday, 6:00-7:00 p.m. Pacific

Live sessions will be recorded for students who are unable to attend. Recordings will be posted to the “Live Session Archive” in Moodle shortly after the session.

Live Sessions – with the Section Instructor

Student teams begin working on their evaluation proposal during Week 07. Teams will meet with their section instructor to discuss the assignment in three 30-minute sessions during weeks 07, 10, and 13. The section instructor will work with each team to try to find a mutually agreeable time during each week. Students should come prepared with questions about the evaluation proposal assignment. Meetings will take place in Adobe Connect or another video conferencing platform selected by the section instructor.

Instructor Announcements

The Instructor Announcements forum in the General section of the course contains an archive of all announcements regarding section-specific information or other important news as the course progresses. Whenever the instructor posts an announcement, each student on the roster receives the announcement via email.

Library Access

As a USC student, you have access to all the USC library resources. For details, see: <http://libguides.usc.edu/distancelearning>

Academic Conduct and Student Support Systems

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in *SCampus* in Section 11, *Behavior Violating University Standards* <https://scampus.usc.edu/b/11-00-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions/>. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct/>.

Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the *Office of Equity and Diversity* <http://equity.usc.edu/> or to the *Department of Public Safety* <http://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us>. This is important for the safety whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person.

The Center for Women and Men <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/> provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage <https://sarc.usc.edu/> describes reporting options and other resources.

A number of USC’s schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the *American Language Institute*, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. <http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali>

The Office of Disability Services and Programs provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations. http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html

If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, *USC Emergency Information* will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology. <http://emergency.usc.edu/>

Lead Instructor



Bill Leach, Ph.D. teaches in the Price School’s online master’s program in Public Administration. He is recognized internationally as an authority on collaborative approaches to policymaking and implementation. His studies of collaborative governance appear in the top journals in public administration, public policy, political science, and environmental management. Dr. Leach has directed over \$1 million of research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, U.S. EPA, and private philanthropies, and has provided scientific and policy advice to

federal and state agencies such as the U.S. Government Accountability Office and the National Research Council. Prior to joining USC, he served as Research Director for the Center for Collaborative Policy at California State University, Sacramento, and Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Policy and Administration. His interdisciplinary training spans political science, economics, and ecology, with degrees in environmental policy from UC Davis (Ph.D.), University of Michigan (M.S.), and UC Berkeley (B.S.). His current scholarship focuses on economics and health policy.

Weekly Outline

<p>Week 1 Introduction to Policy and Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define program evaluation and describe its roles in public administration. • Identify the types of program evaluation (to be examined further throughout the course). <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 1: “Program Evaluation: A Prelude” pp. 3-23 <i>only</i>. • NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Introduction, plus Ch. 1–2, pp. 1–14 • GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 1, pp. 1-9. • Emerson, J. (2009). “But Does it Work? How best to assess program performance.” <i>Stanford Social Innovation Review</i> Winter: 29-30. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
--	--

<p>Week 2 Program Theory, Logic Models, and Hypotheses</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the theory and logic underlying a given program. • Develop a logic model for a program based on its underlying theory. • Articulate the links between program theory and researchable questions, and hypotheses. • Identify independent and dependent variables in causal hypotheses. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 1: “Program Evaluation: A Prelude” pp. 24-38 <i>only</i>. • NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 3 “The Evaluation Process—Getting Started” pp. 15–30 <i>only</i>. • GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Chapter 2: Defining the Evaluation’s Scope” pp. 10-17. <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chen, G. and R.N. Warburton (2006) “Do speed cameras produce net benefits? Evidence from British Columbia, Canada.” <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 25: 661–678. <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Casey Foundation (2009) <i>Getting started: A self-directed guide to outcome map development</i>. By Gienapp, A., Reisman, J., & Stachowiak, S. • Kellogg Foundation (2004) <i>Logic Model Development Guide: Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action</i>. • Gervais, C., F. de Montigny, C. Lacharité, and D. Dubeau (2015) “The Father Friendly Initiative within Families: Using a logic model to develop program theory for a father support program.” <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> 52:133-141. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
<p>Week 3 Evaluation Designs – True-, Quasi-, and Non-Experimental</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the main approaches for detecting cause-and-effect relationships in scientific research, including those based on experimental and non-experimental designs. • Define internal validity and external validity, and discuss how research design affects both. • Discuss the practical and ethical constraints of different types of research designs.

	<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3: “Designing Program Evaluations” pp. 67-100. <p><u>Evaluation Examples (choose one):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HHS [U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services] (2010) “Head Start Impact Study, Final Report: Executive Summary.” 35 pages. • Sikkema, Kathleen J. (2005) "HIV Prevention among Women in Low-Income Housing Developments: Issues and Intervention Outcomes in a Place-Based Randomized Controlled Trial" <i>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i> 599(1): 52-70. • Steele, Jennifer L., Richard J. Murnane, John B. Willett (2010) "Do Financial Incentives Help Low-Performing Schools Attract and Keep Academically Talented Teachers? Evidence from California" <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 29(3): 451-478. <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Chapter 3: The Process of Selecting an Evaluation Design.” pp. 18-30. ○ “Chapter 4: Designs for Assessing Program Implementation and Effectiveness.” pp. 31-49. • Research Methods Knowledge Base <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Design,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/design.php ○ “Quasi–Experimental Designs,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/quasiexp.php <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
<p>Week 4 Sampling and Measurement – Validity & Reliability, Indexes & Scales</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the purpose of sampling, and the strengths and limitations of various types of sampling strategies. • Compare and contrast random sampling versus random assignment. • Operationalize a concept by designing valid and reliable measures. • Use indexes and scales to develop measures with content validity. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ch. 4: Sampling.” pp. 101-110. ○ “Ch. 6: Evaluation Measures.” pp. 147-164.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Methods Knowledge Base <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Sampling,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/sampling.php <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leach, William D., Neil W. Pelkey, and Paul A. Sabatier (2002) "Stakeholder partnerships as collaborative policymaking: Evaluation criteria applied to watershed management in California and Washington." <i>Journal of Policy Analysis & Management</i> 21(4): 645-70. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
<p>Week 5 Data Collection I – Surveys, Interviews, Focus Groups</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the advantages and limitations of various types of data collection methods including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. • Design data collection instruments, such as surveys and interview protocols, to measure variables in a valid and reliable fashion. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ch. 5: Collecting Information.” pp. 119-130 <i>only</i>. • NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Section 6: Review and Comparison of Selected Techniques.” pp. 58–61, 64-65 <i>only</i>. <p><u>Surveys</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krosnick, Jon A. & Stanley Presser (2010) “Question and Questionnaire Design” Ch. 9 in <i>Handbook of Survey Research, 2nd Edition</i>. Emerald Group Publishing. • University of Wisconsin (2010) “Survey Fundamentals: A Guide to Designing and Implementing Surveys.” • Research Methods Knowledge Base, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Survey Research,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/survey.php <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hammer and Wildavsky (1993). “The Open–Ended, Semi–Structured Interview: An (Almost) Operational Guide, Ch. 5 in Wildavsky, <i>Craftways</i>. Transaction Publishers. • Beth L. Leach, “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews,” <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i>, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Dec., 2002), 665–668.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Methods Knowledge Base, “Interviews,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/intrview.php <p>Focus Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asbury, Jo–Ellen (1995) “Overview of Focus Group Research,” <i>Qualitative Health Research</i> 5(4): 414-420. • Cohen, Joel, (2000) “Focus Groups: A Valuable Tool for Public Policy.” California Research Bureau, CRB Note 7(1). <p>Evaluation Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schachter and Liu (2005) "Policy Development and New Immigrant Communities: A Case Study of Citizen Input in Defining Transit Problems" <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(5): 614-623. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
<p>Week 6 Data Collection II – Observation, Content Analysis, Secondary Data</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the advantages and limitations of data collection methods such as observation, content analysis, and secondary data. • Design data collection instruments, such as surveys and interview protocols, to measure variables in a valid and reliable fashion. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving</i>, 5th Edition. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Part II: Assembling Evidence.” pp. 83-112. <p>Evaluation Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naughton, Keith et al (2009) “Understanding Commenter Influence During Agency Rule Development.” <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 28(2):258–277. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Quiz – Day 7
<p>Week 7 Scoping Evaluation Studies - Problem Definition and Needs</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and frame researchable questions based on the political and organizational context of the evaluation, feasibility considerations, the needs of the evaluation sponsor, and interests of key stakeholders. • Develop a strategy for identifying key stakeholder groups, and involving them in the evaluation process as appropriate.

<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 2: “Evaluations Questions and Evidence of Merit” pp. 39-66. • <i>Research Methods Knowledge Base</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Conceptualizing” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/resprob.php ○ “Problem Formulation” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/probform.php <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session w/ section instructor • Quiz – Day 7 • Blog #1 – Day 7 • Mid-semester course evaluation – Day 7
<p>Week 8 Data Analysis I - Descriptive Statistics and Data Visualization</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection. • Articulate and implement sound practices for data display and visualization. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ch. 8: Analyzing Evaluation Data.” pp. 187-191 <i>only</i>. • <i>Research Methods Knowledge Base</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Descriptive Statistics,” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/statdesc.php • Edward Tufte. (2001). <i>The Visual Display of Quantitative Information</i>, Second Edition, Graphics Press LLC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 1: Graphical Excellence ○ Chapter 2: Graphical Integrity. <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Johnson, Gail (2002) “Data Analysis for Description” in <i>Research Methods for Public Administrators</i>. Quorum Books. • Patton, M. Q. (1999) “Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis.” <i>Health services research</i>, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189. • Miles, Matthew B., & A. Michael Huberman (1984) <i>Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods</i>. Sage Publications. • Chapter 7: Cross–Case Displays: Exploring and Describing.

	<p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Lab #1 – Day 4 • Quiz – Day 7 • Blog #2 – Day 7
<p>Week 9 Data Analysis II - Comparing Means and Proportions</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test hypotheses by conducting and interpreting simple inferential analyses of evaluation data. • Understand the difference between statistical significance, effect size, and policy significance. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ch. 8: “Analyzing Evaluation Data.” pp. 187-199. • Newcomer, Kathryn E. & Dylan Conger (2010) “Using Statistics in Evaluation.” Ch. 20 in Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K., Eds. <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition</i>. Jossey-Bass, pp. 454-492. • <i>Research Methods Knowledge Base</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The T-Test” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/stat_t.php • Lane, David et al. <i>Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ XI. “Logic of Hypothesis Testing” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/logic_of_hypothesis_testing/logic_hypothesis.html ○ XII “Tests of Means” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/tests_of_means/testing_means.html <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schmuller. J. 2013. <i>Statistical Analysis with Excel for Dummies</i>. (e-book available through USC) https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgiirsi/?ps=zkg8o1aCuq/DOHENY/237720203/9 <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Lab #2 – Day 4 • Quiz – Day 7 • Blog #3 – Day 7

<p>Week 10 Data Analysis III - Measuring Correlation Between Two or More Variables</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test hypotheses by conducting and interpreting simple inferential analyses of evaluation data. • Calculate and interpret correlation coefficients correctly, and understand their utility and limitations for causal inference. • Read and understand studies using more complex data analysis, including linear regression models. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Research Methods Knowledge Base</i>. “Correlation.” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/statcorr.php • <i>Research Methods Knowledge Base</i>, “The General Linear Model.” http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/genlin.php • Lane, David et al. <i>Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Describing Bivariate Data” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/describing_bivariate_data/bivariate.html ○ “Regression” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/regression/regression.html <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session – Day 1 • Live Session w/ section instructor • Lab #3 – Day 4 • Quiz – Day 7 • Blog #4 – Day 7
<p>Week 11 Criteria Alternatives Analysis</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct a criteria-alternatives matrix to aid public policy decisions. • Describe the benefits and potential pitfalls of weighting each criterion to rank policy alternatives. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Introduction.” pp. xv-xix. ○ “Part I: The Eightfold Path.” pp. 1-82. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Partial Draft – Day 7

<p>Week 12 Best Practice Reviews, Literature Reviews, Meta-analyses</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand evaluation as a form of applied case study research. • Compile a set of professional “best practices” through a review of primary research (e.g. case studies) and secondary research (e.g. literature reviews), and by conducting original interviews with leading practitioners in a given field. • Understand how a formal and systematic review of a body of literature can establish what is known in a particular field, and can identify important unanswered questions. • Appreciate the strengths and limitations of quantitative meta-analyses. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Ch. 5: Collecting Information.” pp. 135-140 <i>only</i>. • Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Part IV, “Smart (Best) Practices Research.” pp. 125-140. • Yin, Robert K. (1998) “The Abridged Version of Case Study Research,” Ch. 8 in Bickman, Leonard & Debra J. Rog Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods. Sage Publications. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Blog #5 – Day 7
<p>Week 13 Formative Evaluation and Outcome Monitoring</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate the purposes and differences between exploratory evaluation, formative evaluation, summative evaluation, performance management, and implementation assessment. • Describe the key steps involved in formative evaluation and outcome monitoring. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rossi, Peter H., Mark W. Lipsey, and Howard E. Freeman (2004) <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>, Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 6: “Assessing and Monitoring Program Processes” pp. 169-201. • AHRQ [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality] (2013) “Formative Evaluation: Fostering Real–Time Adaptations and Refinements to Improve the Effectiveness of Patient–Centered Medical Home Interventions.” pp.1-7. <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Musso, J., et. al., (2002) “Planning Neighborhood Councils in Los

	<p>Angeles: Self Determination on a Shoestring.”</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nelson, Geoffrey et al (2014) “Early implementation evaluation of a multi-site housing first intervention for homeless people with mental illness: A mixed methods approach.” <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> 43:16–26 <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Session w/ section instructor • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Full Draft – Day 7
<p>Week 14 Incorporating Evaluation in Program and Policy Change</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position an evaluation study for maximal impact on planning, policy, or implementation. • Communicate the goals, methods, and findings of an evaluation study to professional, lay audiences. <p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Section 7: A Guide to Conducting Culturally Responsive Evaluations.” p. 75–96. • AEA [American Evaluation Association] (2004) “Guiding Principles for Evaluators.” • Wildavsky, Aaron (1972) “The Self-Evaluating Organization.” <i>Public Administration Review</i> 32(5): 509–520. <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – Day 4 & 7 • Project Pitch (VoiceThread) – Day 7
<p>Week 15 Evaluation Proposals - Final Draft</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write an effective evaluation proposal. • Critique published evaluation research. • Work effectively with professional evaluation consultants. <p>Readings Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion 1 – Day 4 • Discussion 2 – Day 4 • Evaluation Proposal – Day 7 • CATME teammate assessment – Day 7 • Course evaluation – Day 7